

REMARKS

35 U.S. C. 102 (b) Anticipation

Claim 1

The Examiner stated that claim 1 of the present invention was anticipated in light of Rabizadeh (5,606,123). In response to previous Agent for Applicant arguments which addressed this anticipation filed 8/2/2006, the Examiner stated that the arguments while being fully considered were "not persuasive". Specifically the Examiner stated that due to the clocked nature of a microprocessor, the sensor would be "intermittently enabled" to sense pressure.

Agent for Applicant agrees with the Examiner with regards to the operational nature of a microprocessor, however Agent for Applicant must distinguish the present invention in that the microprocessor actively controls the pressure sensor (Present Invention: See Fig 5 (pressure sampler 50), Para [0040]) and signals the pressure sensor to enable it to commence sensing whereas in Rabidzadeh (5,606,123), the microprocessor is a much more passive entity which "intermittently" scans the signal constantly being sent from the pressure sensor (Rabizadeh: See Fig. 11, Col 6, Lns 11-18).

Further, Agent for Applicant must address a subsequent point of difference arising out of the present invention's design. The microprocessor of the present invention actively enables the pressure sampler at predetermined time intervals. (Present invention: See Fig 5, Para [0044]). This active enabling of the pressure sampler to take readings greatly reduces the overall power consumption of the system as was the intent of the inventor. Whereas in the Rabizadeh system, the pressure sensor appears to be always enabled, and thereby always consuming power.

35 U.S. C. 102 (a) Obviousness

Claim 5

The Examiner stated that claim 5 of the present invention was obvious and "unpatentable over Rabidzadeh (5,606,123) in view of Salmond (5,032,287).

Agent for Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the differences as between the present invention and Rabidzadeh addressed in the anticipation rebuttal, the present claim is no longer obvious.

Claims 18 and 20

The Examiner stated that claims 18 and 20 of the present invention were obvious and "unpatentable over Saito et al. (6,171,104) in view of Rabidzadeh (5,606,123).

Agent for Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the differences as between the present invention and Rabidzadeh addressed in the anticipation rebuttal, the present claims are no longer obvious.

Claim 19

The Examiner stated that claim 19 of the present invention was rejected for being obvious over Saito et al (6,171,104) and Rabidzadeh (5,606,123) and further in view of Gauthier (6,007,330).

Agent for Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the differences as between the present invention and Rabidzadeh addressed in the anticipation rebuttal, the present claim is no longer obvious.

CONCLUSIONS

Agent for Applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully solicits same.

Yours respectfully,

Eugene J.A. Gierczak
Agent for Applicant
MILLER THOMSON LLP
Barristers & Solicitors
Scotia Plaza, P.O. Box 1011
40 King Street West, Suite 5800
Toronto, Ontario Canada M5H 3S1
Telephone No. 416.596.2132
Telecopier No. 416.595.8695
EJAG/cdb

CC: Eric Charron (echarron@amvex.com)
1889622.1